

REMARKS

The Office Action of May 7, 2009, and the Advisory Action of July 21, 2009, have been carefully considered.

It is noted that claims 15-18 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) over GB 2,301,548 to Nelsen, et al.

Claims 15-18 are further rejected under 35 USC 102(b) over the patent to Hetmann et al.

In view of the Examiner's rejections of the claims, Applicant has amended claim 15 and added new independent claim 19.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims presently on file differ essentially, and in an unobvious, highly advantageous manner from the constructions disclosed in the references.

Turning now to the references, and particularly to Nelsen, et al., it can be seen that this reference discloses an apparatus and method for installing a hub onto a shaft. The nut 46 of Nelsen has an undercut formed by the groove 52'. During installation of the bearing 14 on the shaft 10, the groove is not accessible for clamping elements of an installation tool. On the contrary, the installation takes place while an O-ring is located

in the groove. Thus, the groove cannot be gripped axially from behind by clamping elements as can the undercut of the presently claimed invention. Furthermore, after installation, the O-ring of Nelsen remains in the groove, so that the groove is not open when the nut is in the final mounting position, as is the undercut of the present invention.

Relative to claim 19, Nelsen does not disclose a nut having an axially extending shank that is axially within the flange and has an internal thread, as in the presently claimed invention. The so-called shank A3 is not within the flange 14, but instead is axially outside it.

In view of these considerations, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 15-18 under 35 USC 102(b) over the above-discussed reference is overcome and should be withdrawn.

The patent to Hetmann et al. discloses a bearing for wheels. The nut of the screw joint of Hetmann et al. has an undercut (groove 58) that bears a retaining ring 59. This retaining ring is part of the screwed joint since it remains in the groove after screwing the parts of the joint together (see Figure 2). Thus, Hetmann et al. does not disclose an undercut which is open in a final mounting position holding the flange on the bolt, as in the presently claimed invention.

Relative to claim 19, the shank A1 does not extend axially within the flange, nor does it have an internal thread, as in the presently claimed invention.

In view of these considerations, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 15-18 under 35 USC 102(b) over the above-discussed references are overcome and should be withdrawn.

Relative to the objection to the drawings and the objection to claim 15, these problems were addressed in the amendment filed July 7, 2009.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
LUCAS & MERCANTI, LLP

By: 

Klaus P. Stoffel, Reg. No. 31,668
Attorney for Applicant(s)
475 Park Avenue South, 15th Floor
New York, New York 10016
Tel. (212) 661-8000

KPS/ns